

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 7, 2005.

Claims 1-21 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21. The present Response amends claim 1 leaving for the Examiner's present consideration of claims 1-21. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the web pages are divided into chunks rather than at least one chunk. This amendment is not believed to change the scope of the claim.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraus, U.S. Patent 6,266,684.

Kraus describes a method of creating and saving multi frame web pages. Frames allow for a display which has into two or more sections, each containing its own HTML document. This is quite different from the system of the present invention. In particular, frames have nothing to do with any type of chunk size limit, gateway limit or the like. The data size of the information in the frames need not be limited. Converting a regular web site to a frame based web site does not have anything to do with data size, chunk limits or gateway limits.

Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. In a network carrying a web page containing data, a method for dividing the web page into chunks, comprising:
 - determining a chunk size limit;
 - dividing the web page data into segments having a size no greater than said chunk size limit; and
 - linking said chunks in sequence.

Kraus does not disclose dividing a web page data into segments having a size no greater than a chunk size limit. Kraus in column 5, lines 15-18 and the abstract, describe a process of creating a new frame and/or resizing the frame. In Kraus, the frame can be resized by dragging

and dropping the edge of the frame boarder. The position of the cursor is used to determine the new size and location of the resized frame. The program then determines the size and location of the empty area previously included within the resized frame by calculating the difference between the old and new coordinates of the resized frame. The size of the frame doesn't effect the amount of data that can be displayed with the frame. Frames can have scroll bars like ordinary web pages, for example. For this reason, the process described in Kraus doesn't include dividing the web page into segments having a size no greater than a chunk size limit. For frames, there is apparently no data size limit at all. Additionally, Kraus does not disclose linking chunks in a sequence.

For the above discussed reasons, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-11 are dependent upon claim 1 and for that reason, and additional limitations of these claims, these claims are believed to be allowable. In particular, claim 4 includes inserting a link to another chunk into the chunk. This is not disclosed or suggested in the Kraus reference. Claim 5 includes creating a table of universal resource locators (URLs) to the chunks of a page. This is not disclosed or suggested in the Kraus reference. Claims 6-8 concern determining a break point of a chunk. Such a break point determination is not disclosed or suggested in the Kraus reference.

Claim 12 reads as follows:

12. In a wireless network carrying content data via the network through at least one gateway, the gateway having a defined gateway limit, a method for transmitting a quantity of content smaller than the gateway limit, comprising:
determining where the gateway limit falls in said content data; and
parsing the content data into at least a first segment and at least a next segment of a size at or below the gateway limit at break points not falling within a word, universal resource locator, or element boundary.

Kraus does not disclose or suggest a gateway limit. The sections of the Kraus that the Examiner points to merely describe the use of frames that have nothing to do with any sort of gateway limit. Claim 12 also claims the parsing of content data into segments that are sized below the gateway limit at the break points. The Kraus reference does not disclose or suggest parsing content data into segments sized at or below a gateway limit. The use of frame in Kraus

does not indicate a limit in the data size of the content in the frames. There is also no hint of the use of the break points in the system of Kraus.

Dependent claims 13-21 are dependent upon claim 12 and for that reason and because of additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

For the above discussed reasons claims 1-21 are believed to be allowable and such is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 24, 2005

By: 

Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800